



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

both the Homeric poems is but one of the many links in the invulnerable chain of proof of the artistic unity of each poem. This is true not only in the relation of each poem to itself but in its relation to the other. This artistic unity is the certain stamp of a single, supreme, genius.

Critical legerdemain with reference to Homer has had its day. Future scholarship in general will be astonished (as much of present scholarship already is) at the influence F. A. Wolf had on the learned world for rather more than a century.

What has become of the doctrines of the Peisistratean theory, Athenian Interpolations, Solar Myths, Expurgations, Traditions (to name but a few)? They have returned to the aether whence they came; see some comparatively recent and unanswerable criticisms along these lines, such as those of John A. Scott in *Classical Philology* 6.419 ff. and 9.395 ff., and in *The Classical Journal* 12.119 ff.; that of Andrew Lang in Appendix B to his book *The World of Homer*; also Dr. Leaf's *Homer and History*, 310, though of course Dr. Leaf is a Separatist (no sentiment not directly quoted or cited should be imputed to any modern authority referred to in this article).

That celebrated Homerist, Friedrich Blass, declares (*Die Interpolationen in der Odyssee*, 12, published in 1904) that the difficulty of conceiving a single Homer author of both poems decreases as our knowledge of antiquity increases. And much progress has been made since even Blass's time. The brilliant J. W. Mackail of Oxford (an Homeric Unitarian) says (*Lectures on Greek Poetry*, 3, published 1911):

During the last generation our knowledge of the ancient world, our methods of investigation, our armament of criticism, have all undergone immense expansion.

As is well known, the stream of reaction against Separatist Criticism flows broad and strong; recall Professor Shewan's highly impressive presentation of authorities in his article, *Recent Homeric Literature*, in *Classical Philology* 7.190 ff.

Why do not the Separatists refute Andrew Lang and Karl Rothe after a lapse of about ten years? Simply because those epoch-making authorities regarding Homer are irrefutable.

There will be generally restored that Homer whose personality was not doubted by the world's two greatest original thinkers, Plato and Aristotle. Their acceptance of that personality—thousands of years nearer the Homeric Age than our time—is a fact of immense import and one to which due weight has not been accorded by modern critics.

One of the three or four foremost of modern intellects, far ahead of his time, answered the Wolfian school nearly a hundred years ago; Goethe, whose genius penetrated the grey mists of Ages, in his final words regarding Homer observed:

Behind these poems there stands a splendid unity—a single, lofty, creative mind.

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON.

C. A. MAURY.

BRUTUS AND THE SHIPS OF THE VENETI

In *De Bello Gallico* 3 Caesar describes the ships of the Veneti and the battle between 220 of these ships and the Roman fleet commanded by Decimus Brutus. The contest presented peculiar difficulties, for the enemy's ships were built of oak in such solid fashion that the beaks of the Roman galleys made but slight impression upon them¹. Moreover, they stood so much higher out of water than the Roman ships that their sterns overtopped even the towers erected on the decks of their opponents². But as in the famous action between Gaius Duilius and the Carthaginians, Roman resourcefulness triumphed over adverse conditions. Since the enemy depended wholly upon their sailing powers³, the Romans made the sails the special object of their attack, cutting the ropes which held them up, and so bringing down sails and yards together.

There seems to be no doubt as to the result of the Romans' device, but exactly how it was accomplished is not perfectly clear from Caesar's language. He describes the manoeuvre as follows (3.14.5-7):

Una erat magno usui res praeparata a nostris, falces praeacutae insertae adfixaeque longioribus, non absimili forma muralium falcium. His cum funes qui antennae ad malos destinabant comprehensi adductique erant, navigio remis incitato praerumpabantur <prorumpabantur, β>. Quibus abscisis <praecisis, β> antennae necessario concidebant; ut, cum omnis Gallicis navibus spes in velis armamentisque consisteret, his ereptis omnis usus navium uno tempore eriperetur.

It is clear enough from this description that certain ropes were cut and that when they were severed the sails fell to the deck. It seems altogether probable that the ropes in question were the halyards. That is the view of Dr. T. Rice Holmes, who in *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul*⁴, 91, renders the passage as follows:

Then with sharp hooks fixed to the ends of long poles, the Romans caught hold of the halyards and pulled them taut; the rowers plied their oars with might and main; and the sudden strain snapped the ropes. Down fell the yards. . . .

With this rendering I should agree, except that I believe that the ropes were cut rather than snapped by the sudden strain. This is indicated by Caesar's words, *quibus abscisis* (3.14.7), as well as by the sharpness of the *falces*, whether *praeacutae* be taken to mean 'very sharp' or 'with sharp edges'⁴. On pages 236-237 Dr. Holmes discusses the question in some detail. He makes it perfectly evident that it would have been impossible for the Romans to cut the 'ropes which bound the yards to the masts' if these were the

¹Neque his nostrae rostro nocere poterant (tanta in his erat firmitudo), neque propter altitudinem facile telum adigebatur, et eadem de causa minus commode copulis continebantur (3.13.8).

²Turribus autem excitatis, tamen has altitudines puppium ex barbaris navibus superabant, ut neque ex inferiore loco satis commode tela adigi possent et missa ab Gallis gravius acciderent (3.14.4).

³cum omnis Gallicis navibus spes in velis armamentisque consisteret (3.14.7).

⁴See *The Classical Journal* 6.133 ff. That the second meaning is possible, although in my opinion not probable, is shown by such uses as Vergil, *Ecl. 7.12* praetexit arundine ripas Mincius; Aeneid 6.5 litora curvae praetexunt puppes.

ceruchi, but that they might have reached the halyards of the Gallic ships, if these were made fast to the gunwale, or near it, as was in all probability the case. In his edition of The Gallic War he gives further arguments in favor of the same opinion, which, considering the height of the enemy's ships, seems to me undoubtedly correct. Since only the yards fell, and not the masts, the ropes which were cut were not stays. They must have been either *ceruchi* or halyards, and under the circumstances could only have been the latter.

Nevertheless it is quite impossible for me to believe that one who knew anything at all about ships and their rigging, or even one who saw a ship for the first time, could by any possibility describe the halyards as *funes qui antemnas ad malos destinabant*. The purpose of the halyards is so obviously that of hoisting the sails, that even a man wholly unacquainted with the sea and with ships would hardly think of calling them 'the ropes which bound the yards to the masts'. I certainly cannot believe that Caesar, who, though perhaps not much of a sailor, had certainly travelled a good deal by sea, would have been guilty of such an inaccuracy.

How, then, is Caesar's account of the battle to be reconciled with the facts of the case? I think this may be done, if we bear in mind that Caesar did not take part in the contest, but witnessed it from the cliffs near by. His account was therefore based upon what he saw from a distance and somewhat imperfectly and on what he afterwards learned from Brutus. Caesar saw the sails of the enemy's ships fall, and either saw or learned from Brutus the contrivance with which the result was accomplished, but he was probably not near enough to see exactly what ropes were cut. He therefore drew his own conclusions at the time and probably never thought of making further inquiries. The result was obvious and important; the exact manner in which it was accomplished was unimportant.

Now, if Brutus brought down the sails and yards of the ships of the Veneti by cutting the halyards, those ships must have been rigged like a modern cat-boat, except that the mast was probably not so far forward, while the sail was approximately square. Or, in other words, they were like the primitive Homeric ship on a large scale, the sail of which together with the yard was hoisted and lowered by the halyards. Such an arrangement is also made probable by the fact that their sails were of skins or of leather⁵, for such sails would have been more readily handled in that way.

But in their size and weight the ships of the Veneti resembled the Roman *naves onerariae*, and these were rigged in quite a different fashion. The yard, although it might in some cases be lowered, was not ordinarily let down when the sails were furled, but the sails were brailed up upon it, as in the well known

Ostia relief. Sometimes this was done from the deck by means of brail-ropes; at other times the sailors went aloft for the purpose, as we know both from the literature and the monuments⁶.

In the ships of war, on the contrary, the mast could be lowered and often was lowered. The process of raising the mast is described in some detail by Lucan, 2.695 ff. Apparently the yard was first attached to the mast with the sail brailed up upon the yard. Then in this case, after the mast was raised, the sails were let down from the yard by the sailors, who went aloft for the purpose, not apparently because it could not have been done from the deck, but to avoid the noise made by the ropes and pulleys, since they were trying to escape the notice of the enemy. Conversely the yards were sent down before the mast was lowered: see *Bellum Alexandrinum* 45.3; Lucan, 3.45; Livy, 36.44.2; Cicero, *Verr.* 2.5.88.

Thus, when Caesar saw ropes being cut which brought down yards and sails together, he naturally thought of the *ceruchi* and described them accurately enough as *funes qui antemnas ad malos destinabant*, without particularly considering the difficulty of reaching ropes at the yards of ships of such great size. We may bear in mind in this connection the criticism which Asinius Pollio passed upon the Commentaries, according to Suetonius (*Julius* 56.4):

Pollio Asinius parum diligenter parumque integra veritate compositos putat, cum Caesar pleraque et quae per alios erant gesta temere crediderit, et quae per se vel consulto vel etiam memoria lapsus perperam ediderit, existimatque rescripturum et correcturum fuisse.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

JOHN C. ROLFE.

REVIEWS

The Dramas and Dramatic Dances of Non-European Races in Special Reference to the Origin of Greek Tragedy, with an Appendix on the Origin of Greek Comedy. By William Ridgeway. Cambridge: at the University Press (1915). Pp. xv+ 448. 92 Illustrations.

In 1910 Professor Ridgeway published a book entitled *The Origin of Tragedy with Special Reference to the Greek Tragedians*. In this he accepted Aristotle's statement that Greek tragedy originated with "the leaders of the dithyramb", but maintained that "certainly in Pindar's own time, and probably from its first rude beginnings, the dithyramb was used in commemoration of heroes" (page 6), never having been confined solely to the ritual of Dionysus. He rejected, moreover, the canonical doctrine that satyric drama formed the intermediate stage in the develop-

⁵In the *naves onerariae*, in which oars were not used, except sometimes for special purposes such as turning the ship, the yard seems to have remained up permanently, the sails being brailed up upon it from the deck by means of brail-ropes, or by sailors who went aloft: compare Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 3.614 f. and the relief from Pompeii in Darmstadt and Saglio, *Dictionnaire des Antiquités*, 1.705 f., 851, and Hill, *Illustrations to School Classics*, 399.

⁶*pelles pro velis alutaeque tenuiter confectae* (3.13.6).